UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692;639	10/24/2003	Eric Rudolph	302126.02	8619

22971 7590 07/17/2007

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER	
EHICHIOYA, FRED I	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2162	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/17/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,639	RUDOLPH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred I. Ehichioya	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 7, and 19 - 23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 7, and 19 - 23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 25, 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 7, and 19 - 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,430,526 issued to Kim R. Toll (Hereinafter "Toll) in view of U.S. patent No. 6,385,201 issued to Atsushi Iwata (hereinafter "Iwata").

Regarding claim 1, Toll discloses a method for providing a topology interface for a multimedia processing system (see column 4, lines 34 – 35), the method comprising:

in response, creating by topology application programming interface a topology interface (see column 2, lines 29 – 35 wherein "topology engine 37 provides a high-level application programming interface (API) by which application 20 is able to configure and control electronic components 65. Application 20 may include a user interface...") capable of being passed to a media processor as an extensible symbolic representation (see column 2, lines 36 – 40 wherein topology description language is interpreted as extensible symbolic representation) of an intended media flow based on at least one of the received media parameters (see column 4, lines 33 – 40 wherein media types are interpreted as media parameters).

Toll does not explicitly teach parameters as claimed.

Iwata discloses receiving a plurality of media parameters (see column 2, lines 3 - 9 wherein the peer group leader comprises negotiating means for exchanging parameters with other group leader nodes .....) identifying at least an identifier, a node type, a data type (see column 4, lines 2 – 4 wherein node identifier is interpreted as the parameter) and a duration (see column 6, lines 52 – 53 wherein the time interval is interpreted as duration).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the data processing art at time of present invention to combine the cited reference because Iwata's teaching of plurality of parameter would have allowed Toll's system to exchange parameters among

nodes. The motivation is that these parameters are used to store resource data for the star topology.

Regarding claim 19, Toll discloses a method for providing a segment topology node interface for a multimedia processing system (see column 4, lines 34 – 35), the method comprising:

in response, creating by a segment topology node application programming interface the segment topology node interface as part of a topology (see column 2, lines 29 – 35 wherein "topology engine 37 provides a high-level application programming interface (API) by which application 20 is able to configure and control electronic components 65. Application 20 may include a user interface...") that is incapable of alteration of input and output nodes to the segment topology node, the segment topology node being separately identifiable (see column 2, lines 32 – 35 wherein the application may be automatically implemented via topology engine 37 without input from user).

Toll does not explicitly teach parameters as claimed.

Iwata discloses receiving a first parameter defining one or more connections for the segment topology node (see column 3, lines 55 – 59 wherein the parameters describe the logical link between nodes);

receiving a second parameter identifying a pointer to a topology to which the segment topology node can connect (see column 4, lines 49 – 55 wherein in this

second step links multiple set of local and remote nodes and the values displayed in Fig.3 are parameters).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the data processing art at time of present invention to combine the cited reference because Iwata's teaching of plurality of parameter would have allowed Toll's system to exchange parameters among nodes. The motivation is that these parameters are used to store resource data for the star topology.

Regarding claim 23, Toll discloses a method for providing an interface for a multimedia processing system (see column 4, lines 34 – 35), the method comprising:

in response, enabling by an application programming interface (see column 2, lines 29 – 35 wherein "topology engine 37 provides a high-level application programming interface (API) by which application 20 is able to configure and control electronic components 65. Application 20 may include a user interface...") a multimedia processing function via an extensible symbolic abstraction of media objects (see column 2, lines 36 – 40 wherein topology description language is interpreted as extensible symbolic representation).

Toll does not explicitly disclose the media processor parameter, the timeline parameter and the topology parameter.

receiving a media processor parameter related to received media data (see column 7, lines 30 – 32 wherein the aggregation unit is the processor parameter);

receiving a timeline parameter related to timing of events to occur for performing media processing (see column 2, lines 3 - 9 wherein the peer group leader comprises negotiating means for exchanging parameters with other group leader nodes .....); and

receiving a topology parameter describing a flow for the received media data (see column 3, lines 55 – 59 wherein the parameters describe the logical link between nodes).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the data processing art at time of present invention to combine the cited reference because Iwata's teaching of plurality of parameter would have allowed Toll's system to exchange parameters among nodes. The motivation is that these parameters are used to store resource data for the star topology.

5. Claims 2 – 7 and 20 - 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toll in view of Iwata and further in view of U.S. patent No. 5,995,512 issued to Russell Wilbur Pogue, Jr., (hereinafter "Pogue).

Regarding claim 2, Toll and Iwata disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in claim 1. Toll or Iwata does not explicitly disclose "GetCacherObject ... GetOptonalFlag" as claimed.

However, Pogue discloses wherein the media parameters include one or more of a GetCacherObject, a GetNodeType, a GetTopoNodeID, a SetProjectStartStop, a GetProjectStartStop, a GetInputCount, a GetOutputCount, a ConnectOut, a GetInput,

a GetOutput, a SetOutputPrefType, a GetOutputPrefType, a SetMajorType, a GetMajorType, a CloneFrom, a SetInputCount, a SetOutputCount, a SetStreamDiscardable, a GetStreamDiscardable, a SetOptionalFlag, and a GetOptonalFlag (see column 9, lines 2 – 13 wherein examiner interprets "GetCacherObject ... GetOptonalFlag" as various parameter functions that implement certain actions; therefore Pogue's parameters/functions that perform variety of actions are interpreted as "GetCacherObject ... GetOptonalFlag").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the data processing art at time of present invention to combine the cited reference because Progue's teaching of parameters/functions would have allowed Toll and Iwata's system to implement one of these parameters/functions such as the parameters/functions for holding, receiving data from high speed network and outputting the data to node interface would have achieved the same result as applicant's parameters of "a GetInput, a GetOutput".

Regarding claim 3, Pogue discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the media parameters include a SetSourceAndDescriptor method that enables a topology loader to create a media stream based on a descriptor (see column 7, lines 52 – 65).

Regarding claim 4, Pogue discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the node type is a segment topology node type such that any modifications made to the topology to add, remove or connect nodes does not alter input and output nodes (see column 16, lines 52 – 65).

Regarding claim 5, Pogue discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the unique identifier enables sharing and reusing the nodes in a plurality of topologies (see Fig. 1 and column 10, lines 15 – 25).

Regarding claim 6, Pogue discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the segment topology node type is created via an IMFSegmentTopologyNode : IUnknown interface (see column 9, lines 2 – 13 wherein examiner interprets "IMFSegmentTopologyNode" as a parameter functions that implement certain actions; therefore one of Pogue's parameters/functions that perform variety of actions is interpreted as IMFSegmentTopologyNode : IUnknown interface).

Regarding claim 7, Pogue discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the segment topology node type is created via an IMFSegmentTopologyNode : IUnknown interface including one or more of GetSegmentTopology(IMFTopolgy* pTopology), SegmentTopology(IMFTopology** ppTopology), SetDirty(BOOL bDirty), BOOL IsDirty0, BOOL GetActualOutputNode(long lOutputIndex, IMFTopologyNode** ppActualNode, long* plNodeOutputIndex), and BOOL GetActualInputNode(long lInputIndex, IMFTopologyNode** ppActualNode, long* plNodeInputIndex) (see column 9, lines 2 – 13 wherein examiner interprets "GetSegmentTopology(IMFTopolgy* pTopology),....., long* plNodeInputIndex" as various parameter functions that implement certain actions; therefore Pogue's parameters/functions that perform variety

of actions are interpreted as "GetSegmentTopology(IMFTopolgy* pTopology),....., long* plNodeInputIndex").

Regarding claim 20, Pogue discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the segment topology node is created by a topology loader operable through one or more of a SetSegmentTopology(IMFTopolgy* pTopology) command, a GetSegmentTopology(IMFTopology** ppTopology) command, a SetDirty(BOOL bDirty) command, a IsDirty0 command, a GetActualOutputNode(long lOutputIndex, IMFTopologyNode** ppActualNode, long* plNodeOutputIndex) command and a GetActualInputNode(long lInputIndex, IMFTopologyNode** ppActualNode, long* plNodeInputIndex) command (see column 9, lines 2 – 13 wherein examiner interprets "SetSegmentTopology(IMFTopolgy* pTopology),....., long* plNodeInputIndex" as various parameter functions that implement certain actions; therefore Pogue's parameters/functions that perform variety of actions are interpreted as "SetSegmentTopology(IMFTopolgy* pTopology),....., long* plNodeInputIndex").

Regarding claim 21, Pogue discloses the method of claim 20 wherein the IsDirty and the SetDirty commands relate to a dirty flag on the topology that is inside the segment topology node to determine whether the topology requires resolving (see column 15, lines 10 – 13 wherein the plus flag is interpreted as a dirty flag).

Regarding claim 22, Pogue discloses the method of claim 20 wherein the GetActualOutputNode command and the GetActualInputNode command are used to find a base level non-segment node connected to one of an output stream and an input stream at a predetermined index of the segment topology node (see column 9, lines 2 – 13 wherein examiner interprets "GetActualOutputNode command and the GetActualInputNode command" as parameters/functions that implement certain actions; therefore one of Pogue's parameters/functions that perform variety of actions is interpreted as "GetActualOutputNode command and the GetActualInputNode command".

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 571-272-4034. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fred I. Ehichioya
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162

July 8, 2007